1	BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD	
2	STATE OF WASHINGTON	
3 4 5 6 7	JONATHAN MCCABE, Appellant, v. WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-99-0025 ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR
9	Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to RCW 41.64.060 and WAC 358-01-040, this matter came on	
10	for a hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on Appellant's	
12	exceptions to the Director's determination dated August 12, 1999. The hearing was held on April	
13	18, 2000, in the Regents Room of the Lewis Alumni Center on the campus of Washington State	
14	University in Pullman, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, and GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, reviewed the record and participated in the decision in this matter.	
15	MORGEN, vice Chair, reviewed the record and p	articipated in the decision in this matter.
16 17	Appearances. Appellant Jonathon McCabe was present and was represented by Tom Watson, Area Representative with the Washington Federation of State Employees. Respondent Washington	
18	State University (WSU) was represented by Karen Erp, Human Resources Professional.	
19	State Chiversity (WSC) was represented by Rairen	Elp, Human Resources Professional.
20	Background. Appellant is the incumbent in p	position number 41525. Appellant's position is
21	classified as a Food Service Worker Lead. Position number 76243 was classified as a Food Service	
22	Supervisor 2 (FSS2). The FSS2 position became vacant. One of the duties of the FSS2 position	
23	was to act as the Catering Cook.	
24		
25	Beginning on March 23, 1998, Appellant assumed	d the Catering Cook duties previously assigned to

Personnel Appeals Board 2828 Capitol Boulevard Olympia, Washington 98504

26

position number 76243. Because Appellant was performing higher level duties, Respondent

temporarily reclassified his position to Cook Lead. Appellant's temporary assignment concluded on August 23, 1998, and Appellant's position was once again classified as a Food Service Worker Lead.

Subsequent to the conclusion of his temporary assignment, Appellant requested a review of the temporary allocation of his position for the time period of March 23, 1998 to September 23, 1998. As a result of the local position review, Appellant's temporary allocation for that period remained Cook Lead. By letter dated January 29, 1999, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel. Appellant requested that his temporary allocation be at the FSS2 level.

The Director's determination was issued on August 12, 1999 and concluded that Appellant's temporary allocation should remain Cook Lead. On September 3, 1999, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues that he was temporarily assigned the duties and responsibilities of the vacant FSS2 position and that Respondent did not review or reallocate the position prior to his temporary assignment. Appellant also argues that the allocation of his temporary position should be based on the duties and responsibilities assigned to the position, not on the duties and responsibilities actually performed. Appellant contends that he was temporarily assigned supervisory responsibilities for student employees consistent with the FSS2 classification. Appellant further argues that he was entitled to be paid as a FSS2 during the time period that he performed the duties of the position.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent argues that Appellant was not assigned to the vacant FSS2 position and that he did not assume the full scope of supervisory duties assigned to that

position. Rather, Respondent asserts that the documents in the record reflect that Appellant's immediate supervisor retained supervisory responsibility for the students assigned to catering. Therefore, Respondent asserts that Appellant's temporary assignment was properly allocated to the Cook Lead classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's temporary assignment was properly allocated to the Cook Lead classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Cook Lead, class code 4026; and Food Service Supervisor II; class code 4021.

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. <u>Liddle-Stamper v.</u>
Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

Appellant has the burden of proving that during his temporary assignment, he was assigned the duties and responsibilities of the FSS2 position. The documents before the Board show that Appellant's immediate supervisor retained supervisory responsibility for student employees. Therefore, Appellant has failed to prove that he was assigned the duties and responsibilities of the vacant FSS2 position.

1	Appellant's position was temporarily reallocated to a higher level classification because he was		
2	performing higher level duties. These higher level duties consisted of overseeing the hot food		
3	production for catering as well as scheduling and training student employees. Lead duties are		
4	defined, in part, as the responsibility to "assign, instruct and check the work of others " as a		
5	regular and significant part of the employee's duties. Appellant's responsibilities fell within this		
6	definition. (See WAC 251-01-255). In addition, Appellant performed inventory, planned product		
7	usage, ordered products, and monitored sanitation standards as described in the Cook Lead		
8	classification. Therefore, Appellant's temporary allocation as a Cook Lead should be affirmed.		
9			
10	Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's		
11	determination dated August 12, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.		
12			
13	ORDER		
14	NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is		
15	denied and the Director's determination dated August 12, 1999, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is		
16	attached.		
17	DATED this, 2000.		
18	WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD		
19			
20			
21	Walter T. Hubbard, Chair		
22			
23	Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair		
24			
25			
26	Leana D. Lamb, Member		